

87-1216



No. 88-

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM, 1987

ARTHUR YOUNG & COMPANY,
Petitioner,

- v. -

ROBERT BURULL AND JEANNE BURULL,
Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

Of Counsel:

LAWRENCE C. BROWN
THOMAS H. BENNIN
MARK D. SAVIN
FAEGRE & BENSON
2300 Multifoods Tower
33 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 371-5300

CARL D. LIGGIO
JOHN MATSON

Counsel of Record

ROBERT G. COHEN
ARTHUR YOUNG & COMPANY
277 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10172
(212) 407-2358

Attorneys for Petitioner Arthur Young & Company

56pp

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. As a matter of law, may sanctions under rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure be denied -- as the Eighth and Ninth Circuits hold, in conflict with the rule in the First, Second, and Seventh Circuits -- when a trial court finds that plaintiffs and their counsel violated the rule by asserting patently frivolous claims?
2. As a matter of law, may sanctions under 28 U.S.C. § 1927 be denied when a trial court finds that plaintiffs' counsel filed an ancillary petition which counsel knew to be false and which "fueled this entire litigation;" filed pleadings that "ran directly counter to the court's direction;" unduly prolonged the trial; and engaged in numerous other instances of unprofessional conduct?

LIST OF PARTIES

The petitioner and defendant below is Arthur Young & Company, a general partnership of certified public accountants which has offices throughout the United States and which provides auditing, accounting, tax and management advisory services to its clients. The respondents and plaintiffs below are Robert and Jeanne Burull. First National Bank of Minneapolis was a defendant below and an appellant in the Eighth Circuit.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
QUESTIONS PRESENTED.....	i
LIST OF PARTIES.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iv
OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
STATUTES INVOLVED.....	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	3
I. PROCEEDINGS IN THE TRIAL COURT THROUGH THE VERDICT.....	3
II. THE SANCTIONS MOTION IN THE TRIAL COURT AND THE COURT OF APPEALS DECISION.....	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	6
I. THE POLICY ISSUES AT STAKE.....	6
II. THE MISAPPLICATION OF RULE 11 BELOW.....	9
III. THE SANCTIONS MANDATED BY SECTION 1927 FOR THE ABUSIVE CONDUCT FOUND BELOW.....	11
CONCLUSION.....	12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>CASES</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
<i>Action Mfg., Inc. v. Fairhaven Textile Corp.</i> , 790 F.2d 164 (1st Cir.), cert. denied, 107 S. Ct. 188 (1986)	8
<i>Bader v. Itel</i> , 791 F.2d 672 (9th Cir. 1986), cert. denied, 108 S. Ct. 85 (1987)	8
<i>Bell v. Bell</i> , 801 F.2d 396 (5th Cir. 1986), cert. denied, 107 S. Ct. 1625 (1987)	8
<i>Eastway Constr. Corp. v. City of New York</i> ("Eastway I"), 762 F.2d 243 (2d Cir. 1985).....	7, 12
<i>Eastway Constr. Corp. v. City of New York</i> ("Eastway II"), 821 F.2d 121 (2d Cir.1987), cert. denied, 108 S. Ct. 269 (1987)	8
<i>Fisher v. CPC Int'l, Inc.</i> , 591 F. Supp. 228 (W.D. Mo. 1984).....	12
<i>Frantz v. United States Powerlifting Fed'n</i> , Nos. 87-1149 & 87-1223, (7th Cir. Dec. 31, 1987).....	10
<i>Golden Eagle Distrib. Corp. v. Burroughs Corp.</i> , 801 F.2d 1531 (9th Cir. 1986).....	9
<i>INVST Fin. Group, Inc. v. Chem-Nuclear Sys., Inc.</i> , 815 F.2d 391 (6th Cir.), cert. denied, 108 S. Ct. 291 (1987).....	8
<i>Jaquette v. Black Hawk County</i> , 710 F.2d 455 (8th Cir. 1983).....	11

<i>Quiros v. Hernandez Colon</i> , 800 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1986)	9
<i>Roadway Express, Inc. v. Piper</i> , 447 U.S. 752 (1980)	11
<i>Sundstrand Corp. v. Sun Chem. Corp.</i> , 553 F.2d 1033 (7th Cir.), cert. denied, 434 U.S. 875 (1977)	11
<i>Szabo Food Serv., Inc. v. Canteen Corp.</i> , 823 F.2d 1073 (7th Cir.), petition for cert. filed, 56 U.S.L.W. 3416 (U.S. Nov. 20, 1987) (No. 87-828)	10
<i>Tedeschi v. Smith Barney Harris Upman & Co.</i> , 757 F.2d 465 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 474 U.S. 850 (1985)	8, 9-10
<i>Unioil, Inc. v. E. F. Hutton & Co.</i> , 809 F.2d 548 (9th Cir. 1986), cert. denied, 108 S. Ct. 85 (1987)	8
<i>United States v. Ross</i> , 535 F.2d 346 (6th Cir. 1976)	11
<i>Westmoreland v. CBS, Inc.</i> , 770 F.2d 1168 (D.C. Cir. 1985)	11
<i>Zaldivar v. City of Los Angeles</i> , 780 F.2d 823 (9th Cir. 1986)	7

STATUTES:

15 U.S.C. § 771(2)	4, 5, 9
15 U.S.C. § 77q(a)	4, 5, 9
15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)	3-4, 5, 9
28 U.S.C. § 1254(1)	2
28 U.S.C. § 1927	passim

RULES AND REGULATIONS:

Fed. R. Civ. P. 11.....*passim*

OTHER AUTHORITIES:

Comment, *Litigant Responsibility: Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 and Its Application*,
27 B.C.L. Rev. 385 (1986).....7

Fed. R. Civ. P. 11 advisory committee note.....11

Schwarzer, *Sanctions Under the New Federal Rule 11--A Closer Look*, 104 F.R.D. 181 (1985).....12

No. 88-

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM, 1987

ARTHUR YOUNG & COMPANY,
Petitioner,

- v. -

ROBERT BURULL AND JEANNE BURULL,
Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

Arthur Young & Company ("Arthur Young") petitions this Court for a Writ of Certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, which is reported at 831 F.2d 788 (8th Cir. 1987), is reprinted in Appendix ("App.") A. The Memorandum and Order of the trial court (the "Sanctions Order") is reprinted in Appendix B. The trial court's first and second summary judgment decisions are reprinted in Appendices C and D, respectively.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Court of Appeals was entered on October 21, 1987. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

STATUTES INVOLVED

Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides, in relevant part:

The signature of an attorney or party constitutes a certificate by him that he has read the pleading, motion, or other paper; that to the best of his knowledge, information, and belief formed after reasonable inquiry it is well grounded in fact and is warranted by existing law or a good faith argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law, and that it is not interposed for any improper purpose, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the cost of litigation. . . . If a pleading, motion, or other paper is signed in violation of this rule, the court, upon motion or its own initiative, shall impose upon the person who signed it, a represented party, or both, an appropriate sanction, which may include an order to pay to the other party or parties the amount of the reasonable expenses incurred because of the filing of the pleading, motion, or other paper, including a reasonable attorney's fees.

Section 1927 of Title 28, U.S.C., provides:

Counsel's liability for excessive costs. Any attorney or other person admitted to conduct cases

in any court of the United States or any Territory thereof who so multiplies the proceedings in any case unreasonably and vexatiously may be required by the court to satisfy personally the excess costs, expenses, and attorney's fees reasonably incurred because of such conduct.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I.

PROCEEDINGS IN THE TRIAL COURT THROUGH THE VERDICT

Arthur Young prevailed at trial on the claim of Robert and Jeanne Burull that, together with Barbara and Stephen Adams and First Bank of Minneapolis ("First Bank"), Arthur Young defrauded plaintiffs out of their stock in United States Satellite Services, Inc. ("USSS").

Plaintiffs twice survived summary judgment motions by Arthur Young only because of their claim that "a grand conspiracy between the Adams, First Bank and Arthur Young & Company . . . induced the Burulls to pledge their stock as collateral" for a loan First Bank made to USSS in May 1983. Order, April 25, 1985 (the "First Summary Judgment Decision"), App. C at C3-C4.¹

On the third day of a thirty-five day trial plaintiffs stipulated that they had no factual basis for any claim against Arthur Young with respect to events before July 1983 and they withdrew their primary liability claim under section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934,

¹ The trial court later denied a second summary judgment motion for essentially the same reasons.

15 U.S.C. § 78j(b). Thus, plaintiffs abandoned the very assertion that had narrowly saved them from summary judgment.

While Arthur Young's second summary judgment motion was *sub judice*, plaintiffs filed a second amended complaint and added new claims under sections 12(2) and 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933, 15 U.S.C. §§ 77l(2) and q(a). The trial court dismissed those claims *sua sponte*. Order, April 3, 1986 (the "Second Summary Judgment Decision"), App. D. at D7-D8. It ruled that section 12(2), which is explicitly limited to claims by buyers of securities, could not provide any basis for a claim by the Burulls, who were sellers. *Id.* at D8. The court also cited the Eighth Circuit decisions over the last 20 years that leave no doubt but that section 17(a) does not provide a private claim for relief. *Id.* at D7-D8.²

II.

THE SANCTIONS MOTION IN THE TRIAL COURT AND THE COURT OF APPEALS DECISION

Following the jury verdict in its favor, Arthur Young moved for sanctions under Rule 11, 28 U.S.C. § 1927 and the court's inherent power. In its Sanctions Order the trial court castigated Karla Wahl, plaintiffs' principal counsel, and plaintiffs themselves.

- The court ruled that Mr. Burull and Ms. Wahl signed a bankruptcy petition for USSS which they knew were false and which "laid the foundation for

² Plaintiffs did not argue -- until their brief on appeal -- that they were seeking the reversal of existing law.

the Burulls' present lawsuit. . . ." Sanctions Order, App. B. at B4. The court added, however, that, even though the false bankruptcy petition "fueled this entire litigation . . . [it] was falsified and filed in the bankruptcy court before this litigation even began" and therefore did not warrant sanctions. *Id.* at B12.

- The court concluded that the Burulls' second amended complaint, which added the section 12(2) and 17(a) claims, "ran directly counter to the court's direction that an amended complaint be filed to narrow the issues and . . . [e]qually important, the additional claims, on their face, lacked merit" *Id.* at B5. The court concluded that the section 12(2) and 17(a) claims were "the appropriate subject of a sanction." *Id.* at B11. However, because the court had dismissed those claims on its own initiative, it did not impose sanctions "despite the technical violation of Rule 11." *Id.*
- The court also rejected sanctions for the section 10(b) claim, but its reasoning is less clear. It declined to say there was no evidence to support plaintiffs' conspiracy claim despite its own comments as to the claim's implausibility, *id.* at B10-B11, and plaintiffs' concession on the third day of trial that they had no factual basis for the allegation.
- Finally, the court concluded that plaintiffs' counsel had repeatedly tried to elicit testimony about matters previously ruled inadmissible; had unduly prolonged the trial and caused defendants unnecessary delay, expense, and frustration; and had engaged in conduct "most unprofessional." *Id.*

at B6, B10, B12. Even with all of this, the trial court declined to impose sanctions under 28 U.S.C. § 1927.

Arthur Young and First Bank appealed the trial court's denial of sanctions to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. Arthur Young argued that the trial court erred (1) in not imposing sanctions despite its finding that plaintiffs had violated rule 11 and (2) in not ruling that plaintiffs' counsel violated 28 U.S.C. § 1927, given its findings with regard to her conduct.

In a brief opinion, the Eighth Circuit rejected these arguments, as well as those of First Bank that the trial court should have sanctioned, under its inherent power, the conduct it found to have occurred. It ruled that, despite the trial court determination that rule 11 had been violated, sanctions were not appropriate because not every claim plaintiffs asserted ran afoul of rule 11. Although plaintiffs' counsel had not challenged the findings of misconduct on her part, the Eighth Circuit said that it would defer to the discretion of the trial court in declining to impose sanctions under section 1927. App. A at A5.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

I.

THE POLICY ISSUES AT STAKE

The 1983 amendment of rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure reflected the sense that something was terribly wrong with the manner in which parties and their counsel were conducting federal court litigation in the United States. The dramatic increase in litigation in the years preceding the amendment brought into the federal courts an increasing number of cases filed

only for their *in terrorem* effect on "deep pocket" defendants. Courts were inundated with groundless suits and motions; dilatory and unprofessional conduct was too often in evidence; and the courts had little real power to restrain any but the most egregious abuse.

Rule 11 was amended to provide the courts a potentially powerful weapon which they could use, along with 28 U.S.C. § 1927, to attack frivolous claims and improper conduct.³ See *Zaldivar v. City of Los Angeles*, 780 F.2d 823, 829 n.5 (9th Cir. 1986); *Eastway Constr. Corp. v. City of New York* ("*Eastway I*"), 762 F.2d 243, 254 (2d Cir. 1985). Comment, *Litigant Responsibility: Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 and Its Application*, 27 B.C.L. Rev. 385, 405 (1986). The new rule (1) requires counsel to make some prefiling inquiry into both the factual and legal basis for any pleading or motion; (2) replaces the prior "good faith" test with a more stringent objective standard; and (3) mandates that sanctions must be imposed if the rule is violated.

In part in response to the dramatic increase in *in terrorem* litigation, motions for sanctions under rule 11 have begun to engulf the federal trial courts. With little definitive guidance, the lower courts have struggled with questions of how vigorously and in what manner they should impose sanctions. Through this burgeoning body of case law, increasing conflicts are developing, particularly as to rule 11 and as to the very issue presented by this petition.

³ Rule 11 applies to pleadings or motions filed; section 1927 relates generally to the conduct of counsel in litigation.

Amended rule 11 and section 1927 can serve the efficient functioning of the federal court system only if they are conscientiously applied and if litigants and their counsel know the consequences that will surely follow their violation. Trial courts defeat the purpose of rule 11 if, as here, they decline to impose sanctions where no prefiling inquiry, either legal or factual, occurred and where they have specifically found that rule 11 has been violated. Appellate courts send the wrong message to the bar of their circuits where, as here, they do not reverse denials of sanctions in instances where rule 11 and section 1927 have been clearly violated and do not in such instances stress the importance of compliance with them and the consequences for their violation.

This Court has never spoken to rule 11 and rarely to section 1927. Unlike those cases where the petitions for *certiorari* sought review of sanctions imposed under rule 11,⁴ this case presents the Court with an opportunity to consider the denial of sanctions under rule 11 despite a finding that it had been violated and to resolve the conflict that is developing among the circuits. The issue is critically important, the errors of the lower courts grievous, and the time exactly right for this Court to send the message that rule 11 means what it says; that it must

⁴See, e.g., *Eastway Constr. Corp. v. City of New York* ("Eastway II"), 821 F.2d 121 (2d Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 108 S. Ct. 269 (1987); *INVST Fin. Group, Inc. v. Chem-Nuclear Sys., Inc.*, 815 F.2d 391 (6th Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 108 S. Ct. 291 (1987); *Unioil, Inc. v. E.F. Hutton & Co.*, 809 F.2d 548 (9th Cir. 1986), *cert. denied*, 108 S. Ct. 85 (1987); *Bell v. Bell*, 801 F.2d 396 (5th Cir. 1986), *cert. denied*, 107 S. Ct. 1625 (1987); *Bader v. ITEL*, 791 F.2d 672 (9th Cir. 1986), *cert. denied*, 107 S. Ct. 880 (1987); *Action Mfg., Inc. v. Fairhaven Textile Corp.*, 790 F.2d 164 (1st Cir.), *cert. denied*, 107 S. Ct. 188 (1986); *Tedeschi v. Smith Barney Harris Upman & Co.*, 757 F.2d 465 (2d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 850 (1985).

be enforced vigorously; and that, if it is violated, sanctions will be imposed.

II

THE MISAPPLICATION OF RULE 11 BELOW

That rule 11 was violated in this case is not in issue.⁵ The trial court so found with respect to the claims under sections 12(2) and 17(a) and the court of appeals noted "the frivolousness of the allegation that Arthur Young had participated from the outset in a violation of § 10(b). . . ." App. A. at A3. The Eighth Circuit based its decision to affirm the denial of sanctions entirely on the fact that there were also nonfrivolous claims asserted and on the theory that sanctions are appropriate only when the entire pleading "itself is frivolous . . .," *id.* at A4, quoting *Golden Eagle Distrib. Corp. v. Burroughs Corp.*, 801 F.2d 1531, 1540 (9th Cir. 1986). By permitting frivolous claims if they are asserted along with nonfrivolous claims, the Eighth Circuit has invited litigants into a quagmire of rule 11 litigation over whether the "meritless elements of a complaint combine to render the pleading frivolous as a whole. . . ." App. A. at A4.

The Eighth Circuit may deride Arthur Young's "reductionist approach to Rule 11," *id.* at A4, but the rule itself clearly states that the court "shall impose . . . an appropriate sanction" where it has been violated and the "reductionist" approach has been adopted by the First, Second, and Seventh Circuits. See *Quiros v. Hernandez Colon*, 800 F.2d 1, 2-3 (1st Cir. 1986); *Tedeschi v. Smith*

⁵ Neither plaintiffs nor their counsel appealed the trial court's finding that rule 11 was violated.

Barney Harris Upman & Co., 757 F.2d 465, 466 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 474 U.S. 850 (1985); *Frantz v. United States Powerlifting Fed'n*, Nos. 87-1149 & 87-1223, slip op. at 3, 5, 8 (7th Cir. Dec. 31, 1987); *Szabo Food Serv., Inc. v. Canteen Corp.*, 823 F.2d 1073, 1077 (7th Cir.), petition for cert. filed, 56 U.S.L.W. 3416 (U.S. Nov. 20, 1987) (No. 87-828).⁶

That a pleading or motion may contain nonfrivolous elements may be a factor in a trial court determination of "an appropriate sanction," see Rule 11, but, as the First, Second, and Seventh Circuits apparently recognize, that cannot defeat the application of rule 11 in

⁶ In *Frantz*, Judge Easterbrook, writing for the Seventh Circuit, said:

Each claim takes up the time of the legal system and the opposing side. A single claim in an antitrust case may occasion the expenditure of hundreds or thousands of hours, as opposing counsel try to verify or refute the allegations and theories. Rule 18(a) permits the liberal joinder of claims, but each joined claim, potentially the basis of separate litigation, must have a foundation — the same foundation it would have needed if the claims had been pursued separately. Just as evidence that Perkins is a thief does not justify an accusation that he is a murderer, so a colorable legal theory about boycotts of weight lifters does not excuse a baseless allegation about price fixing in the television business. Rule 11 applies to all statements in papers it covers. Each claim must have sufficient support; each must be investigated and researched before filing. See *Szabo*, 823 F.2d at 1080-82, 1082-84 (separately analyzing each claim in the complaint); *Hill v. Norfolk & Western Ry.*, 814 F.2d 1192, 1200 (7th Cir. 1987); *District No. 8 of Machinists v. Clearing*, 807 F.2d 618 623 (7th Cir. 1986). Contra, *Burull v. First National Bank of Minneapolis*, 831 F.2d 788 (8th Cir. 1987).

Slip Op. at 8-9.

the first instance. Any other result will undermine the stated purpose of rule 11 to "discourage dilatory or abusive tactics and help to streamline the litigation process by lessening frivolous *claims* or defenses." Fed. R. Civ. P. 11 advisory committee note (emphasis added). *Accord Westmoreland v. CBS, Inc.*, 770 F.2d 1168, 1180 (D.C. Cir. 1985).

III.

THE SANCTIONS MANDATED BY SECTION 1927 FOR THE ABUSIVE CONDUCT FOUND BELOW

Like rule 11, section 1927 is designed to curb litigation abuses but it is broader in scope because it is not tied to the signing of a pleading, motion or other paper. Section 1927 addresses the situation where "actions are extended unnecessarily by lawyers who exploit or abuse judicial procedures. . . ." *Roadway Express, Inc. v. Piper*, 447 U.S. 752, 757 n.4 (1980). It provides for sanctions where counsel acts unreasonably or vexatiously or exhibits "a reckless disregard of the duty owed by counsel to the court." *Jaquette v. Black Hawk County*, 710 F.2d 455, 462 n.16 (8th Cir. 1983), quoting *United States v. Ross*, 535 F.2d 346, 349 (6th Cir. 1976).⁷ The courts have available the developing law of what is objectively "reasonable" under rule 11 and should conclude that conduct is unreasonable and reckless if it is clear that competent counsel would act in a completely different manner. *See*,

⁷ In another context, "recklessness" has been described as "an extreme departure from the standards of ordinary care. . . ." *Sundstrand Corp. v. Sun Chem. Corp.*, 553 F.2d 1033, 1045 (7th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 434 U.S. 875 (1977).

e.g., *Eastway I*, 762 F.2d at 254; *Fisher v. CPC Int'l, Inc.*, 591 F. Supp. 228, 236-37 (W.D. Mo. 1984).

The trial court found that plaintiffs' pleading in this case was grounded on a knowingly false bankruptcy petition and it catalogued a series of violations of the standards of proper conduct at trial by plaintiffs' counsel. These include her vexatious waste of the time of all concerned by extending a relatively simple trial to an astonishing thirty-five trial days; by persisting in lines of questioning on subjects that the court had clearly ruled inadmissible; and by her general unprofessional conduct. Sanctions Order, App. B. at B6. It was an abuse of discretion to make these findings and then not impose sanctions. By any objective measure, that is unreasonable conduct in which competent counsel would not engage.

The error of the courts below presents this Court with an opportunity to speak to the bar on the importance of section 1927. It should make clear that section 1927 is measured by an objective standard of reasonable conduct and that, where counsel fails to meet that standard, they risk sanctions under this section. In this way, section 1927 and rule 11 will present a common, uniform standard by which both trial conduct and pleadings and motions will be judged. So applied, they will function together as effective weapons to deter improper conduct in federal court litigation.

CONCLUSION

"Misconduct, once tolerated, will breed more misconduct and those who might seek relief against abuse will instead resort to it in self-defense." Schwarzer, *Sanctions Under the New Federal Rule 11 -- A Closer Look*, 104 F.R.D. 181, 205 (1985). In this case the failure of

the lower courts to apply properly rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and 28 U.S.C. § 1927 sends to litigants and their counsel a message of judicial tolerance of misconduct. Through reversal of the lower court decisions, this Court can send the proper message: that rule 11 and section 1927 must be vigorously applied to prevent dilatory, abusive, and improper conduct in federal court litigation.

Dated: January 19, 1988
New York, New York

Respectfully submitted,

CARL D. LIGGIO
JOHN MATSON
Counsel of Record
ROBERT G. COHEN
ARTHUR YOUNG & COMPANY
277 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10172
(212) 407-2358

Of Counsel:
LAWRENCE C. BROWN
THOMAS H. BENNIN
MARK D. SAVIN
FAEGRE & BENSON
2300 Multifoods Tower
33 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 371-5300

Attorneys for Petitioner Arthur Young & Company



**United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

Nos. 87-5073, 87-5074

First National Bank of Minneapolis.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854

On Appeal from the
United States District
Court for the District
of Minnesota

Submitted: October 12, 1987

Filed: October 21, 1987

Before ARNOLD, Circuit Judge, HENLEY, Senior Circuit Judge, and BOWMAN, Circuit Judge.

This lawsuit returns to this Court on defendants' appeal from the District Court's¹ order denying their post-judgment motion for sanctions against plaintiffs under Fed. R. Civ. P. 11, 28 U.S.C. §1927, and the court's inherent power.

The odyssey of litigation in this case began in 1983, after the First National Bank of Minneapolis (the Bank) called a substantial loan to United States Satellite Systems (USSS), following an unfavorable audit of USSS by Arthur Young & Company. Plaintiffs Robert and Jeanne Burull, the founders of USSS, filed a bankruptcy petition to protect the company's assets, and the Bank responded by foreclosing on the Burulls' stock in the company. At the ensuing foreclosure sale, the Burulls' stock, amounting to 50 per cent. of the voting shares, was purchased by Barbara Adams, who already owned the other half of the stock in USSS.

The Burulls felt cheated, and they filed this lawsuit against Arthur Young, the Bank, and Adams.² While the

¹ The Hon. Paul A. Magnuson, United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota.

² The Burulls settled with Adams at trial.

final version of their complaint raised twenty-three claims for relief under federal securities statutes and the commercial common law, each claim articulated some aspect of the Burulls' central contention that defendants had collaborated unlawfully to maneuver the Burulls out of their stock. After defeating defendants' motions for summary judgment and for a directed verdict, the Burulls lost their case before jury.³ The successful defendants Arthur Young and First Bank then moved the District Court for attorneys' fees as sanctions under Rule 11, §1927, and the court's inherent power. The District Court denied the motion, and we affirm.

The Burulls' lawsuit, taken as a whole, was legally and factually substantial enough to reach a jury. Arthur Young argues, however, that it is entitled to Rule 11 sanctions because the Burulls' complaint contained several counts which were meritless as a matter of law,⁴ and one count which would prove factually groundless.⁵ The thrust of Arthur Young's appeal is that the District Court could not, as a matter of law, decline to impose sanctions once it had established that the Burulls had filed a pleading which incorporated frivolous grounds for relief.

³ We dismissed the Burulls' appeal from the judgment in *Burull v. First National Bank of Minneapolis*, 817 F.2d 56 (8th Cir. 1987).

⁴ These counts claimed relief under §§12(2) and 17(a) of the 1933 Securities Act, provisions which were clearly inapplicable to this litigation.

⁵ This count alleged that Arthur Young violated §10(b) of the 1934 Securities Exchange Act by conspiring with the other defendants from the outset to defraud the Burulls. At trial, plaintiffs' counsel stipulated that she had no evidence of Arthur Young's involvement until after the alleged conspiracy could have commenced.

We are not persuaded by Arthur Young's reductionist approach to Rule 11. Rule 11 directs sanctions "only when the 'pleading, motion or other paper' itself is frivolous, not when one of the arguments in support of a pleading or motion is frivolous." Golden Eagle Distributing Corp. v. Burroughs Corp., 801 F.2d 1531, 1540 (9th Cir. 1986). By definition, every unsuccessful complaint, at some level of analysis, contains either a flawed argument or an unsupported allegation. Whether meritless elements of a complaint combine to render the pleading frivolous as a whole is a "matter for the court to determine, and this determination involves matters of judgments and degree." O'Connell v. Champion International Corp., 812 F.2d 393, 395 (8th Cir. 1987).

While the court found that the Burulls' meritless claims, viewed in isolation, would be the appropriate subject of a sanction, it also found that their inclusion had no appreciable effect on the litigation of the Burulls' otherwise nonfrivolous lawsuit.⁶ We see no reason to disturb the District Court's judgment here.

The Bank argues that the District Court was bound to award Rule 11 sanctions against the Burulls for having filed a false bankruptcy petition prior to this litigation. Although the bankruptcy of USSS certainly forms part of the background of this dispute, the Burulls' petition is not

⁶ The Burulls' claims based on §§12(2) and 17(a) were dismissed by the District Court on its own motion, only a week after plaintiffs filed their pleading. Defendants were never called on to address these claims in any pleading or brief. Similarly, the frivolousness of the allegation that Arthur Young had participated from the outset in a violation of §10(b) did not release Arthur Young from defending the Burulls' alternative claim that Arthur Young had aided and abetted co-defendant's alleged fraudulent scheme in violation of §10(b).

"a pleading, motion, or other paper" submitted as part of this lawsuit. See Adduono v. World Hockey Ass'n, 824 F.2d 617 (8th Cir. 1987). The District Court was within its discretion in denying the Bank's motion. The Bankruptcy Court has power to deal with this infraction. See Arkansas Communities, Inc. v. Mitchell, 827 F.2d 1219 (8th Cir. 1987).

Arthur Young and the Bank also argue that sanctions are warranted under §1927. They point to the District Court's repeated expressions of frustration with the trial tactics and techniques of the 'Burulls' counsel, and argue that the court incorrectly applied a subjective test of counsel's bad faith, overlooking her objectively vexatious conduct. We disagree. The District Court applied the correct standard when it could not "conclude with certainty that the Burulls or [their trial counsel] acted vexatiously or in bad faith." (Order p.13, emphasis added.) In any event, sanctions under §1927, unlike those under Rule 11, are discretionary, not mandatory. Over the last three years the District Court has become all too familiar with this grueling litigation, and we have no reason to interfere with its judgment that sanctions are inappropriate here. Nor do we see any abuse of discretion in the denial of sanctions under the court's inherent power. The order of the District Court is accordingly

Affirmed.

A true copy.

Attest:

CLERK, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS,
EIGHTH CIRCUIT.

APPENDIX B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA THIRD DIVISION

Robert Burull and Jeanne Burull,
Plaintiffs,

v.

Civil File No. 3-83-1564

First National Bank of Minneapolis,
a national banking association;
and Arthur Young and Company,
a partnership,

Defendants.

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Karla R. Wahl, Esq., 4717 IDS Center, 80 South Eighth
Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402,

and

John Bonner, III, Esq., 5775 Wayzata Blvd., Suite 745,
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55416,
appeared on behalf of plaintiffs.

Roger J. Magnuson, Esq. and Jeffrey L. Sikkema, Esq.,
Dorsey & Whitney, 2200 First Bank Place East,
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402, appeared on behalf of
First National Bank of Minneapolis.

Lawrence C. Brown, Esq., Faegre & Benson, 2300 Multifoods Tower, 33 South Sixth Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402,
appeared on behalf of Arthur Young & Company.

Following approximately thirty-five days (35) of trial, on July 22, 1986, the jury returned a verdict in this matter, finding in favor of defendants First National Bank of Minneapolis (First Bank) and Arthur Young and Company (Arthur Young) on all claims of plaintiffs Robert and Jeanne Burull (Burulls). In accordance with the jury verdict, the court entered judgment in favor of First Bank and Arthur Young on July 28, 1986. The court is now confronted with various post-trial motions, including motions by First Bank and Arthur Young for an award of attorneys' fees and the imposition of sanctions against the Burulls and their attorneys. The other motions before the court include (1) the Burulls' motion for the imposition of sanctions on First Bank, Arthur Young, and their attorneys; (2) the motion of First Bank to require the Burulls to order an adequate trial transcript to support their appeal to the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals; and (3) the motion of First Bank for an order requiring the Burulls to post a bond in the amount of \$15,000.00 to ensure payment of costs on appeal.¹ The court held a hearing on the various motions on October 17, 1986.

¹ Arthur Young similarly moved for an order requiring the Burulls to post a \$15,000.00 bond for costs on appeal. During the interim, the Burulls revised their issues on appeal on at least two occasions and have dropped their appeal with respect to all issues relating to Arthur Young. Because Arthur Young is no longer involved in the appeal, the court need not address its motion for a bond on appeal.

SANCTIONS AND ATTORNEYS' FEES

First Bank and Arthur Young move separately for an award of attorneys' fees and the imposition of sanctions against the Burulls and their attorneys pursuant to the court's inherent power, Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and 28 U.S.C. § 1927.² To support the motions, both defendants rely not only on the merits of the Burulls' asserted legal claims, but also on the alleged abuse of the judicial process by the Burulls and their counsel. More specifically, defendants contend that the Burulls and their counsel abused the judicial process by their conduct prior to, during, and following the litigation of this matter.

As the court has previously described, this action arises out of the rise and fall of United States Satellite Services, Inc. (USSS), a company founded by the Burulls. By this lawsuit, the Burulls contend that their business partner in USSS, Barbara Adams, together with First Bank, the lender, and Arthur Young, the accountant, collectively engaged in a course of conduct designed from the outset to defraud the Burulls out of their interest in USSS. The method allegedly chosen to achieve that goal

² First Bank also bases its motion for attorneys' fees and sanctions on Minn. Stat. § 549.21 and the contract between the Burulls and First Bank. The court summarily rejects First Bank's argument that its attorneys' fees may be recovered pursuant to the parties' contract. The court finds that First Bank's attorneys' fees in this matter did not result from First Bank's efforts to enforce its rights within the meaning of the security agreements and the guarantees. With respect to an award of attorneys' fees under Minn. Stat. § 549.21, the court concludes that the analysis under the various other authorities is applicable and adequately addresses the relevant questions of bad faith, frivolous claims, and fraud upon the court. See Minn. Stat. § 549.21.

was to induce the Burulls to pledge their stock as collateral for the bank loans and then demand payment at an appropriate time so that Barbara Adams could obtain complete control of USSS.

Prior to initiating suit, the Burulls attempted to avoid or at least slow down First Bank's calling of the USSS loan by filing a bankruptcy petition on behalf of USSS. Mr. Burull, together with his personal attorney, Karla Wahl, signed the petition, avowing that he was authorized to do so by USSS and that the shareholders of USSS had unanimously adopted certain resolutions. Such resolutions in fact never existed and the evidence adduced at trial confirmed that Mr. Burull and his attorney knew such statements to be false. The filing of this bankruptcy petition laid the foundation for the Burulls' present lawsuit, limiting First Bank's options and forcing First Bank to foreclose on the USSS stock rather than pursuing the assets of the corporation.

Shortly thereafter, the Burulls filed the present lawsuit. In their original complaint, the Burulls asserted claims against Barbara Adams, her husband, Stephen Adams, First Bank, and Arthur Young arising primarily under Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule 10b-5. The Burulls also asserted claims of common law fraud, negligence, and commercial unreasonableness against First Bank and Arthur Young. The first step of the Burulls was to unsuccessfully move for a Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) and prevent the foreclosure sale by First Bank. To support their motion for a TRO, the Burulls contended, among other things, that the USSS stock had no value -- a contention later vigorously disputed by Burulls.

The Burulls' initial complaint withstood defendants' first motions for summary judgment. Although characterizing the allegations as rather implausible, the court could not conclude as a matter of law that the Burulls' securities claims would fail.

As the time for trial drew near, the court became concerned about the Burulls' theory for relief. In order to narrow the issues for trial and, at the very least, formulate a concrete theory of the case, the court requested that the Burulls submit a proposed verdict form and an amended complaint. For the first time in the history of the case, the Burulls indicated by special verdict questions that they intended to pursue civil RICO claims against the defendants. The civil RICO claims were not included in the Burulls' amended version of the complaint in accordance with the court's oral admonishment. Similarly, in their amended complaint, the Burulls asserted entirely new claims arising under §§ 12(2) and 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933. The Burulls' addition of claims ran directly counter to the court's direction that an amended complaint be filed to narrow the issues and more concretely define the legal theories of the case. Equally important, the additional claims, on their face, lacked merit and the court accordingly dismissed such claims on its own motion.

Despite the weaknesses mentioned above, the Burulls' newly amended complaint once again survived defendants' renewed motions for summary judgment. In affirming its previous position, the court held that genuine issues of fact existed on the various claims under Section 10(b) and Rule 10b-5.

The case proceeded to trial on or about April 21, 1986 and finally concluded on July 22, 1986. Prior to the

presentation of evidence, the Burulls reached a settlement agreement with defendants Barbara and Stephen Adams, who were consequently dismissed from the action. Following the first few days of trial, the Burulls also agreed to dismiss certain claims against the remaining defendants, including all claims against Arthur Young for primary liability under the federal and state securities laws. During the course of trial, the court admonished the Burulls' counsel on various occasions, usually in relation to counsel's repeated attempts to elicit testimony about matters previously ruled inadmissible. All such attempts by counsel resulted in objections and bench conferences which were unnecessarily duplicative and time consuming.

Based upon the facts as highlighted and put into the context of this prolonged and frustrating litigation, the court is faced with the difficult task of determining whether or not the award of attorneys' fees and the imposition of sanctions against the Burulls and their attorneys are warranted. In considering this issue, the court recognizes its responsibility to detect and sanction abusive litigation practices in an effort to improve the judicial system. See Jaquette v. Black Hawk County, Iowa, 710 F.2d 455, 461-64 (8th Cir. 1983).

Courts are increasingly turning toward sanctions as a means of curbing litigation abuse and improving the litigation process. The imposition of sanctions, in turn, is often interwoven with the subject of shifting the burden of attorneys' fees. The power of a court to impose sanctions and shift the burden of attorneys' fees derives from a variety of sources, including the court's inherent authority, 28 U.S.C. § 1927, and Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

A federal court possesses the power to access attorneys' fees against a party who has commenced or continued an action in bad faith, vexatiously, wantonly, or for oppressive reasons. Actors' Equity Association v. American Dinner Theatre Institute, 802 F.2d 1038, 1041 (8th Cir. 1986); Jaquette v. Black Hawk County, Iowa, 710 F.2d at 462; Oliveri v. Thompson, 803 F.2d 1265, 1272 (2d Cir. 1986). This power to access attorneys' fees, however, is subject to restrictive standards. A court should impose attorneys' fees "only when extraordinary circumstances or dominating reasons of fairness so demand." Actors' Equity Association v. American Dinner Theatre Institute, 802 F.2d at 1042 (citing Nepera Chemical, Inc. v. Sea-Land Service, Inc., 794 F.2d 688, 702 (D.C. Cir. 1986)). Similarly, court should not award attorneys' fees unless a party's claim is frivolous, unreasonable, or groundless. Actors' Equity Association v. American Dinner Theatre Institute, 802 F.2d at 1042

A court also has the power to assess excess costs and attorneys' fees against an attorney personally pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1927. This statutory authority provides that "[a]ny attorney . . . who so multiplies the proceedings in any case unreasonably and vexatiously may be required by the court to satisfy personally the excess costs, expenses, and attorneys' fees reasonably incurred because of such conduct." 28 U.S.C. § 1927. While courts have articulated various standards in interpreting § 1927, they have consistently required a rather high standard of fault. Generally, courts impose sanctions under § 1927 only when an attorney has acted in bad faith. See Oliveri v. Thompson, 803 F.2d at 1273; Dreiling v. Peugeot Motors of America, Inc., 768 F.2d 1159, 1165 (10th Cir. 1985). See also Jaquette v. Black Hawk County, Iowa, 710 F.2d at 462. The court's authority under § 1927 reaches not only acts of bad faith in instituting litigation, but also bad faith conduct in

the course of litigation. See Lipsig v. National Student Marketing Corp., 663 F.2d 178, 181-82 (D.C. Cir. 1980) ("While the presence of merit in a claim or defense may well negate any notion of bad faith in its filing, it certainly cannot justify abuse of the judicial process in the methodology of its prosecution.") (emphasis in original).

Finally, a court may impose sanctions, including reasonable attorneys' fees, under Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. That rule provides in part

Every pleading, motion, and other paper of a party represented by an attorney shall be signed by at least one attorney of record.... The signature of an attorney or party constitutes a certificate by him that he has read the pleading, motion, or other paper, that to the best of his knowledge, information, and belief formed after reasonable inquiry it is well grounded in fact and is warranted by existing law or a good faith argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law, and that it is not interposed for any improper purpose, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the cost of litigations.... If a pleading, motion, or other paper is signed in violation of this rule, the court, upon motion or upon its own initiative, shall impose upon the person who signed it, a represented party, or both, an appropriate sanction, which may include an order to pay to the other party or parties the amount of the reasonable expenses incurred because of filing of the pleading, motion, or other paper, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 11.

In contrast to the rather restrictive standards governing the court's inherent power and § 1927, Rule 11 provides a more expansive standard for the imposition of sanctions and the awarding of attorneys' fees. Under Rule 11, subjective bad faith is not the touchstone for sanctions. An attorney's good faith no longer serves as a "safe harbor" against the imposition of sanctions. Instead, Rule 11 endorses an objective standard and imposes an affirmative duty on each attorney to conduct a reasonable inquiry into the viability of a pleading before it is signed. Zaldivar v. City of Los Angeles, 780 F.2d 823, 829-32 (9th Cir. 1986); Eastway Construction Corp. v. City of New York, 762 F.2d 243, 253-54 (2d Cir. 1985). Rule 11 sanctions are to be imposed against an attorney and/or his client when it appears that a pleading has been interposed for an improper purpose, or where, after reasonable inquiry, a competent attorney could not form a reasonable belief that the pleading is well grounded in fact and is warranted by existing law or a good faith argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law. Zaldivar v. City of Los Angeles, 780 F.2d at 830-32; Eastway Construction Corp. v. City of New York, 762 F.2d at 254.

Turning from the governing legal standards to the specific facts of the instant case, the court notes again that defendants seek sanctions not only on the basis of the Burulls' legal claims, but also on the conduct of the Burulls and their attorneys during the course of this litigation. As all parties are aware, this court has in no uncertain terms indicated its frustration with the litigation of this case. From the early stages of this suit, the court has voiced its concern over the plausibility of the Burulls' grand conspiracy claims which form the principal part of their lawsuit. Similarly, the court expressed concern over the manner in which the lawsuit was being conducted by

the Burulls and their counsel.³ Indeed, as previously detailed, the court on various occasions admonished counsel concerning several aspects of trial tactics and technique. The frustration felt by the court and all parties involved was only increased by the prolonged trial. It is in this light that the court is called upon to address the question of sanctions.

The court addresses first the defendants' motions for sanctions and attorneys' fees as they relate to the frivolousness of the Burulls' claims for relief. The principal argument advanced by First Bank and Arthur Young with respect to this issue is that the Burulls' claims of securities fraud, based upon the alleged conspiracy or concerted action among the Adams, First Bank, and Arthur Young, had no basis in fact. More specifically, First Bank and Arthur Young contend that the Burulls failed to introduce any evidence to support such claims and that the primary claims of the Burulls consequently lacked merit and were frivolous.

Admittedly, this court characterized the Burulls' claims as implausible on more than one occasion. Nevertheless, the court rejected defendants' repeated efforts to dispose of such claims. Considering all the evidence

³ During the pretrial stages of this action, the Burulls were represented solely by Karla Wahl. Prior to trial, the court suggested and strongly encouraged Ms. Wahl to associate herself with additional counsel for the purpose of conducting the actual trial. Shortly thereafter, John Bonner, III became involved in the case as Burulls' trial counsel. Together, Ms. Wahl and Mr. Bonner conducted the trial on behalf of the Burulls. The court, at this time, commends Mr. Bonner on the professional manner in which he conducted himself during the trial of this matter. The court's reference to Burulls' counsel in this opinion excludes for the most part the actions of Mr. Bonner.

presented at trial, the court again declines to find that the Burulls' claims were plainly frivolous or without any factual foundation. Although the Burulls relied solely on circumstantial evidence to support their allegation of a conspiracy by the defendants, the court cannot say such evidence did not support their claim. Undoubtedly, the evidence and its inferences were weak at best and rejected by the jury. In considering sanctions, however, the court must avoid hindsight. On this basis, the court refuses to impose sanctions upon the Burulls or their attorney, Ms. Wahl, on the ground that their main claims for violations of § 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, Rule 10b-5, and the comparable state securities laws were frivolous. Additionally, the court cannot say that such claims were advanced for an improper purpose within the meaning of Rule 11

In addition to the claims arising under § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5, the Burulls by their amended complaint also asserted claims arising under §§ 12(2) and 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933. As the court held in its Order dated April 2, 1986, these claims on their face lacked merit. Because Rule 11 requires a reasonable investigation and consideration of claims before including them in a complaint, such claims by the Burulls are the appropriate subject of a sanction. The problem the court faces, however, is that these claims were summarily dismissed by the court on its own initiative. Neither First Bank nor Arthur Young gave such claims serious consideration or devoted any significant time toward disposing of them. Under these circumstances, the court does not find sanctions warranted, despite the technical violation of Rule 11. Oliveri v. Thompson, 803 F.2d at 1280. This conclusion, however, in no way condones the conduct of counsel in including such meritless claims, especially in

light of the court's directions not to include additional claims for relief in the amended complaint.

The court next addresses the motions for sanctions and attorneys' fees as they relate to the conduct of the Burulls and their attorney during the course of this litigation. Because Rule 11, by its terms, applies only to a "pleading, motion, or other paper" signed by an attorney, these issues are more appropriately dealt with under the court's inherent authority and 28 U.S.C. § 1927.

The court has previously highlighted various conduct on the part of the Burulls and their attorney which the court and the defendants have found objectionable. Beginning with the pre-litigation filing of the bankruptcy petition and continuing through the post-trial filings, the trial tactics of the Burulls and Ms. Wahl have been most unprofessional on several occasions. The court finds particularly disturbing the false bankruptcy petition which, in effect, fueled this entire litigation. Such petition, however, was falsified and filed in the bankruptcy court before this litigation even began. As such, the court does not deem it conduct which would warrant sanctions in connection with the present litigation before this court.

With respect to the remaining activities and conduct which defendants contend constitute an abuse of the litigation process, the court finds itself constrained by the restrictive standards governing its inherent power to sanction and 28 U.S.C. § 1927. Without doubt, the trial tactics and techniques of the Burulls and their counsel have resulted in unnecessary delay, expense, and frustration to First Bank and Arthur Young. Nevertheless, the court cannot conclude with certainty that the Burulls or Ms. Wahl acted vexatiously or in bad faith in the

instituting or conducting of this lawsuit.⁴ The motions for the imposition of sanctions and attorneys' fees of First Bank and Arthur Young is thus denied.

The court reiterates the difficult task presented by the defendants' motion for sanctions. Although the court concludes, after careful consideration, that sanctions are not warranted under the circumstances, it also emphasizes that it in no way condones the manner in which this lawsuit was conducted.

Before concluding, the court addresses the Burulls' motion for the imposition of sanctions on First Bank, Arthur Young, and their attorneys. To support their motion, the Burulls contend that they have incurred excessive costs, expenses, and attorneys' fees due to the alleged abusive motion practice of First Bank and Arthur Young. Specifically, the Burulls assert that First Bank and Arthur Young filed numerous motions which were designed solely to harass, intimidate, and unreasonably and vexatiously multiply the proceedings in this action. The court rejects this argument, finding that First Bank and Arthur Young did not interpose any motions for an improper purpose. The Burulls' motion for sanctions is thus denied.

⁴ First Bank relies upon the alleged perjurious trial testimony of the Burulls to support its motion for sanctions. The court is not inclined to rule on the veracity of the Burulls in the context of this motion. In any event, the court does not believe it appropriate to impose monetary sanctions on an attorney based upon a finding that her client is not worthy of belief. See *Oliveri v. Thompson*, 803 F.2d 1265, 1277-78 (2d Cir. 1986).

TRIAL TRANSCRIPT ON APPEAL

First Bank files this motion pursuant to Rule 10(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure for an order requiring the Burulls to provide a trial transcript for their appeal of this matter. The Burulls oppose First Bank's motion, contending that their appeal involves only a legal issue for which no trial transcript is needed.

The Burulls originally filed a Notice of Appeal which included four separate issues to be presented on appeal. One of the issues initially presented was whether the jury verdict was contrary to the evidence. Following their Notice of Appeal and accompanying statement of issues, the Burulls filed a certification that a transcript of the district court proceedings was not necessary. Subsequently, the Burulls modified their statement of issues on two separate occasions, dropping three of the four issues originally listed. The remaining issue is whether the court erred in failing to submit to the jury the Burulls' claim of the alleged breach of duty of good faith and fair dealing of First Bank. The Burulls submit that such issue is purely legal, requiring only a partial transcript of the court's charge conference.

The court must reject Burulls' argument on this point. The court necessarily considers this matter based upon its own notes and recollection. As such, the court cannot recite with absolute certainty the previously stated basis for its ruling. Implicit in that ruling, however, was the court's conclusion that the Burulls' claim for a breach of the duty of good faith and fair dealing against First Bank was not adequately supported by the evidence. A proper review of this issue on appeal thus requires a trial transcript which includes, at a minimum, that evidence

relevant to such issue. See Garnes v. Gulf & Western Manufacturing Co., 789 F.2d 637, 640 n.3 (8th Cir. 1986).

The court is not in a position to determine exactly what portion of the trial transcript is needed. While the court is somewhat reluctant to require the Burulls to designate the entire trial transcript, it has little choice in the absence of any designation whatever by the Burulls. As appellants, the Burulls bear the responsibility of providing an adequate record on appeal, including a transcript of all evidence relevant to their contentions. See Brattrud v. Town of Exline, 628 F.2d 1098, 1099 (8th Cir. 1980). Accordingly, the court will grant First Bank's motion to require the Burulls to provide a trial transcript on appeal. Specifically, the Burulls are ordered to designate all portions of the trial transcript which contain evidence relevant to the claim against First Bank for a breach of good faith and fair dealing.

BOND FOR COSTS ON APPEAL

First Bank's final motion is pursuant to Rule 7 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure for an order requiring the Burulls and their attorneys to post a bond in the amount of \$15,000.00 to ensure payment of costs and expenses on appeal. Included in the \$15,000.00 amount of costs is First Bank's estimate of attorneys' fees to be incurred in connection with the appeal.

Appellate Rule 7 vests discretionary power in the district court to "require an appellant to file a bond or provide other security in such form and amount as it finds necessary to ensure payment of costs on appeal in a civil case." Fed. R. App. P. 7. The costs referred to, however, include only those costs which may be assessed against an unsuccessful litigant under Rule 39 of the

Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and do not include attorneys' fees on appeal. In re American President Lines, Inc., 779 F.2d 714, 716 (D.C. Cir. 1985). For this reason, the court grants First Bank's request for a bond but reduces the amount to more accurately represent the likely costs to be incurred on appeal. The court in its discretion therefore orders the Burulls to file a bond in the amount of \$2,000.00 to ensure the payment of First Bank's estimated costs on appeal.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The motion of defendant First National Bank of Minneapolis for an award of attorneys' fees and the imposition of sanctions against plaintiffs, Robert and Jeanne Burull, and their counsel is denied.

2. The motion of defendant Arthur Young and Company for an award of attorneys' fees and the imposition of sanctions against plaintiffs, Robert and Jeanne Burull, and their counsel is denied.

3. The motion of plaintiffs, Robert and Jeanne Burull, for an award of attorneys' fees and the imposition of sanctions against defendants, First National Bank of Minneapolis and Arthur Young and Company, is denied.

4. The motion of First National Bank of Minneapolis for an order requiring plaintiffs, Robert and Jeanne Burull, to provide a trial transcript for their appeal is granted and Robert and Jeanne Burull shall order all portions of the trial transcript which contain evidence relevant to the claim against First National Bank of Minneapolis for breach of the duty of good faith and fair dealing.

5. The motion of First National Bank of Minneapolis for an order requiring the plaintiffs, Robert and Jeanne Burull, to post a bond to ensure payment of costs and expenses on appeal is granted and Robert and Jeanne Burull shall post a bond in the amount of \$2,000.00 to ensure payment of the costs and expenses of First National Bank of Minneapolis on appeal.

6. The motion of Arthur Young and Company for an order requiring the plaintiffs, Robert and Jeanne Burull, to post a bond to ensure payment of costs and expenses on appeal is denied as moot.

Dated: January 8 , 1987.

Paul A. Magnuson
United States District Judge

APPENDIX C

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA THIRD DIVISION

Robert Burull and Jeanne
Burull,

Civil File No. 3-83-1564

ORDER

Plaintiffs,

v.

Barbara Adams, Stephen Adams,
First Bank of Minneapolis,
a National banking association,
and Arthur Young & Company,

Defendants.

A hearing was held before the undersigned on March 8, 1985 upon cross motions for summary judgment. Karla R. Wahl, Esq., appeared on behalf of plaintiffs. Roger J. Magnuson, Esq., and Jeffrey L. Sikkema, Esq., appeared on behalf of defendants.

This action arises out of the rather rapid rise and fall of an enterprise known as United States Satellite Services, Inc. (USSS), a company engaged in the business of operating master satellite antenna television systems. Robert and Jeanne Burull were the founders of USSS. In 1983 the Burulls negotiated a deal with Barbara Adams whereby Barbara Adams would arrange to provide financing to USSS and in return she would receive 50% of the voting shares of USSS.

On May 27, 1983 Robert Burull, Jeanne Burull and Barbara Adams entered into a Credit Agreement with the First Bank of Minneapolis (First Bank) whereby First Bank agreed to loan USSS up to \$475,000. The Burulls and Barbara Adams were personally liable for the full amount of the loan. The loan was made by a series of promissory notes which permitted the First Bank to demand payment at any time without cause.

Shortly after the Credit Agreement was signed, a dispute erupted between the Burulls and Barbara Adams over the management of the company. In addition, the financial strength of USSS deteriorated rapidly. First Bank called the notes and when it was unable to collect from USSS it foreclosed upon the stock of the Burulls and Barbara Adams. The stock of USSS was sold at an auction to Barbara Adams for \$10,000.

In this action the Burulls have brought suit against Barbara and Stephen Adams, First Bank, and Arthur Young & Company, the accounting firm that audited the books of USSS alleging, inter alia, violations of federal and state securities laws. First Bank and Arthur Young & Company have brought a series of motions for summary judgment. The Burulls have also brought a motion for summary judgment seeking to have this court hold, as a matter of law, that the foreclosure sale of USSS stock was commercially reasonable.

Rule 10b-5 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 provides in relevant part that:

It shall be unlawful for any person, [to employ any device or engage in any practice which would operate as a fraud or make an untrue statement or

omission] in connection with the purchase or sale of any security.

17 CFR § 240.10(b)-05. Rule 10b-5 does not prohibit fraud in the abstract. It only condemns fraud if it occurs in connection with the purchase or sale of any security. See Superintendent of Insurance v. Bankers Life & Casualty Co., 404 U.S. 6 (1971). To determine whether First Bank committed any 10b-5 violation it is necessary to examine the conduct which plaintiffs allege constitutes the fraud and its relationship, if any, to the purchase or sale of any security.

The misrepresentations allegedly committed by First Bank fall into two categories. First, the Burulls allege that First Bank did not disclose that it had a substantial banking relationship with Stephen Adams, Barbara Adams' husband. Second, the Burulls allege that First Bank misrepresented the content of the Credit Agreement pursuant to which the Burulls received loans from First Bank. The purchase or sale of a security in the present case occurred either when First Bank sold the stock of USSS to Barbara Adams at its foreclosure sale or when the Burulls initially sold 50% of the voting stock of USSS to Barbara Adams.

The allegation that First Bank did not disclose its relationship with Stephen Adams is at the heart of the Burulls' claim against First Bank. Moreover, the failure of Arthur Young & Company to disclose its relationship with Stephen Adams is the material omission which is said to constitute the Rule 10b-5 violation of Arthur Young. The central premise behind the Burulls' 10b-5 cause of action is that there was a grand conspiracy between the Adams, First Bank and Arthur Young & Company whereby they all engaged in a course of conduct

which was designed from the outset to defraud the Burulls out of their investment in USSS. The method chosen to achieve that goal was to induce the Burulls to pledge their stock as collateral and then demand payment on the notes at an appropriate time so that Barbara Adams could obtain complete control over USSS.

In ruling on the motion of Arthur Young and First Bank, this court is mindful that this is a motion for summary judgment and summary judgment may not be granted unless it is clear that the non-moving party is not entitled to recover under any discernible circumstances. Any doubt about the facts must be construed in favor of the non-moving party. See Vette Company v. Aetna Casualty, 612 F.2d 1076 (8th Cir. 1980).

While this court would note that the purported 10b-5 violation against First Bank and Arthur Young & Company is, at best, an implausible explanation of the reason for the Burulls' financial misfortune, it cannot say that as a matter of law that the Burulls will be unable to prove the essential elements of a 10b-5 violation. The most persuasive argument in support of the defendants' motion is that the Burulls have not met the requirement that the fraud must be in connection with the purchase or sale of a security. This court cannot discern a true connection between the First Bank-Adams and Arthur Young & Company-Adams relationship and ultimate foreclosure sale in which the Burulls lost their stock. However, to the extent the plaintiffs can prove that the entire series of events, from the original loan transaction through the foreclosure sale, was a pre-planned conspiracy to defraud the plaintiffs of their investment in USSS, the court cannot say as a matter of law that their claim must fail. Accordingly, the court will deny the motions of

Arthur Young & Company and First Bank for summary judgment on the federal securities claim.

First Bank and Arthur Young & Company have also made a series of motions for summary judgment on the state law claims asserted by the plaintiffs. To the extent those claims arise out of the identical transaction as the federal securities claim and contain many of the same essential elements, this court's previous discussion is incorporated by reference and the court will deny those motions.

The plaintiffs have also brought a motion for summary judgment seeking to have this court hold, as a matter of law, that the sale of the Burulls' stock by First Bank was commercially unreasonable. The question of whether a sale was commercially reasonable is not a question which can readily be decided on a motion for summary judgment based upon the record presently before the court.

For the reasons stated above, IT IS ORDERED that:

1. All motions for summary judgment are denied.

Dated: April 23, 1985

Paul A. Magnuson
United States District Judge

APPENDIX D

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA
THIRD DIVISION

Robert Burull and Jeanne
Burull,

Civil File No. 3-83-1564

Plaintiffs,

MEMORANDUM
AND ORDER

v.

Barbara Adams, Stephen Adams,
First Bank of Minneapolis,
a National banking association,
and Arthur Young & Company,

Defendants.

Karla R. Wahl, Esq. 4717 IDS Center, 80 South Eighth Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402, and John Bonner, III, Esq. 5775 Wayzata Blvd., Suite 745, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55416, appeared on behalf of plaintiffs.

Joseph W. Anthony, Esq., Fruth & Anthony, P.A., 1350 International Centre, 900 Second Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402, appeared on behalf of Barbara and Stephen Adams.

Roger J. Magnuson, Esq. and Jeffrey L. Sikkema, Esq., Dorsey and Whitney, 2200 First Bank Place East, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402, appeared on behalf of First Bank of Minneapolis.

Lawrence C. Brown, Esq., and Carol H. Hearn, Esq., Faegre & Benson, 2300 Multifoods Tower, 33 South Sixth Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402, appeared on behalf of Arthur Young & Company.

This matter comes before the court on the renewed motions for summary judgment of defendants First Bank of Minneapolis (First Bank) and Arthur Young & Company (Arthur Young). In addition, plaintiffs renew their motion for summary judgment on their claim that the foreclosure sale of stock was commercially unreasonable. The court heard oral arguments on the motions on March 14, 1986.

The essential facts underlying this dispute have been set forth in the court's previous Order of April 23, 1985 and need not be repeated in detail here. For purposes of the present motions, it is sufficient to note that plaintiffs, Robert and Jeanne Burull, by their Second Amended Complaint allege violations of the securities laws' anti-fraud provisions on the part of the several defendants. The alleged violations relate to two separate "sales" by the Burulls of their shares of stock in United States Satellite Services, Inc. (USSS): (1) the May 1983 sale of shares to defendants Barbara and Stephen Adams and the pledge of shares by Burulls to First Bank; and (2) the December 1983 sale of Burulls' stock to Adams as a result of foreclosure action by First Bank.

In an Order dated April 23, 1985, the court denied the defendants' initial motions for summary judgment, finding that it could not conclude as a matter of law that the Burulls would be unable to prove the essential elements of a Rule 10b-5 violation. First Bank and Arthur Young now renew their motions for summary judgment,

contending primarily that Burulls cannot establish the "in connection with" requirement of a Rule 10b-5 claim. For the reasons stated below, the court affirms its earlier position and denies the defendants' renewed motions for summary judgment.

Initially, the court notes that Burulls' Rule 10b-5 claims against First Bank arise not only from the forced sale of stock to Adams in December 1983, but also from the May 1983 pledge of stock to First Bank. While First Bank vigorously contends that such pledge of stock was not a "sale" within the meaning of Rule 10b-5, the court must reject that argument. In Rubin v. United States, 449 U.S. 424, 431 (1981), the Supreme Court held that a pledge of stock was a "sale" for purposes of § 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933. In Marine Bank v. Weaver, 455 U.S. 551 (1982), the Court stated that Rubin's holding extended to claims under § 10(b) of the Securities Act of 1934:

The Court of Appeals also concluded that the pledge of a security is a sale [within § 10(b)], an issue on which the federal Circuits were split. We held in Rubin v. United States, 449 U.S. 424, 101 S. Ct. 698, 66 L. Ed. 2d 633 (1981), that a pledge of stock is equivalent to a sale for the purposes of the antifraud provisions of the federal securities laws. Accordingly, in determining whether fraud may have occurred here "in connection with the purchase or sale of any security," the only issue now before the Court is whether a security was involved.

455 U.S. at 554 n. 2 (emphasis original). On the basis of the Supreme Court's statement, the court must reject First Bank's position on this issue and conclude that the Burulls' pledge of USSS stock to First Bank constituted a

"sale" of a security under Rule 10b-5. See Head v. Head, 759 F.2d 1172, 1174-75 (4th Cir. 1985); Chemical Bank v. Arthur Andersen & Company, 726 F.2d 930, 940 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, ____ U.S. ____, 105 S. Ct. 253 (1984).

In their renewed motion for summary judgment, First Bank and Arthur Young focus their attention on the Rule 10b-5 requirement that the alleged fraud be "in connection with the purchase or sale of any security." These defendants rely upon the Second Circuit's restrictive reading of that requirement in Chemical Bank v. Arthur Andersen & Company, 726 F.2d 930 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, ____ U.S. ____, 105 S. Ct. 253 (1984).

Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder proscribe fraud "in connection with the purchase or sale of any security." 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b); 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5. For the most part, the "in connection with" requirement has been liberally read by the courts. In reliance upon language of the Supreme Court in Superintendent of Insurance of New York v. Bankers Life & Casualty Co., 404 U.S. 6 (1971), lower courts have generally held that the connection requirement will be satisfied if the alleged fraud merely "touches" the purchase or sale. See In re Catanella and E. F. Hutton and Co. Securities Litigation, 583 F.Supp. 1388, 1408 (E.D. Pa. 1984) and cases cited therein.

In Chemical Bank v. Arthur Andersen & Co., *supra*, the case relied upon by defendants, the Second Circuit established a more restrictive application of the "in connection with" requirement of Rule 10b-5. In that case, Frigitemp Corporation arranged a bank loan for its subsidiary, Frigitemp guaranteed Elsters' promissory note and pledged as security 100% of Elsters' stock. Following Frigitemp's bankruptcy, the lending banks brought a Rule

10b-5 action against Frigitemp's accountant, alleging they had relied on falsified financial statements when extending the loan. The Second Circuit held that the misrepresentations were not made in connection with the pledge of Elsters' stock because the pledge was totally unrelated to the false financial statements of Frigitemp. Id., 726 F.2d at 944-45. Those facts are clearly distinguishable from the present case, where the alleged misrepresentations by First Bank are related to the initial pledge of stock to First Bank.

In addition, the court finds the "in connection with" element satisfied with respect to the foreclosure sale of Burulls' stock. Admittedly, broadly read, Chemical Bank stands for the proposition that Rule 10b-5 does not apply in cases where the misrepresentations do not pertain to the securities themselves. Id., 726 F.2d at 943. The facts of that case, however, do not support such a broad reading and subsequent courts have not applied the rule announced in Chemical Bank so restrictively. See Angelastro v. Prudential-Bache Securities, Inc., 764 F.2d 939, 942-46 (3rd Cir.) cert. denied, 106 S. Ct. 267 (1985). Moreover, the court believes that the case of Teltronics Services, Inc. v. Anaconda-Ericsson, Inc., 587 F.Supp. 724 (E.D.N.Y. 1984), aff'd on other grounds, 762, F.2d 185 (2d Cir. 1985) is inapposite. While that court dismissed a Rule 10b-5 claim founded on similar conspiracy allegations, the court found that the forced sale of securities was not integral to the alleged fraudulent scheme to plunge the plaintiff corporation into bankruptcy. That is not the situation in this case, for the foreclosure sale of USSS stock is at the heart of the defendants' scheme, as alleged by Burulls.

As the court noted in its previous order, the alleged conspiracy on the part of the defendants is rather

implausible. In this respect, the Burulls have a heavy burden to bear in order to substantiate their Rule 10b-5 claims. Nevertheless, the court must affirm its earlier position that it cannot conclude as a matter of law that the Burulls' Rule 10b-5 claims must fail.

The court also notes that the Burulls' Second Amended Complaint includes claims of aiding and abetting against First Bank and Arthur Young. To establish aiding and abetting liability under § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5, three requirements must be satisfied: (1) the existence of a securities law violation by the primary party (as opposed to the aiding and abetting party); (2) "knowledge" of the violation on the part of the aider and abettor; and (3) "substantial assistance" by the aider and abettor in the achievement of the primary violation. Metge v. Baehler, 762 F.2d 621, 624 (8th Cir. 1985), cert. denied, 106 S.Ct. 798 (1986) (citing Stokes v. Lokken, 644 F.2d 779, 782-83 (8th Cir. 1981)). These individual requirements are not to be considered in isolation, but rather in relation to one another, especially the requirements of knowledge or scienter and substantial assistance. Id. The court has reviewed the files and records in this case and believes that genuine issues of material fact exist with respect to the claims of aiding and abetting under § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5 which preclude summary judgment.

The court also has before it Burulls' renewed motion for summary judgment seeking to have the court hold, as a matter of law, that the sale of Burulls' stock by First Bank was commercially unreasonable. Specifically, Burulls contend that summary judgment is appropriate since reasonable persons can only reach a conclusion that the sale was commercially unreasonable. This court disagrees under the present circumstances and affirms its

previous order that the issue of commercial reasonableness cannot be readily decided on a motion for summary judgment.

Before concluding, the court addresses additional alleged violations of the anti-fraud provisions of the securities laws which the Burulls raise in their Second Amended Complaint. Specifically, the court on its own motion, addresses the legal sufficiency of the Burulls' claims arising under §§ 12(2) and 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933. Because the Burulls just recently filed their Second Amended Complaint, the defendants have not had an opportunity to file any motions with respect to the additional claims under §§ 12(2) and 17(a). Nevertheless, the court on its own motion may dismiss a claim under Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Martin-Trigona v. Stewart, 691 F.2d 856, 858 (8th Cir. 1982), citing 5C Wright & A. Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure, § 1357 at 593 (1969). The court believes such action is appropriate in this case given the fact that the matter is scheduled to go to trial in the near future. Moreover, the court is somewhat disturbed insofar as it understood that Burulls' Second Amended Complaint was not for the purpose of including additional claims. Apparently the court did not make itself clear for the Burulls added claims under §§ 12(2) and 17(a).

In Counts Two, Five, Ten, and Thirteen of their Second Amended Complaint, the Burulls allege that the defendants' conduct violated § 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933. Burulls' claims under that section, however, must fail. Under the present state of law in the Eighth Circuit, § 17(a) provides no private cause of action and Burulls' claims under that section must be dismissed. Greater Iowa Corp. V. McLendon, 378 F.2d 783, 788-90 (8th

Cir. 1967); Shull v. Dain, Kalman & Quail, Inc., 561 F.2d 152, 155 (8th Cir. 1977), cert. denied, 434 U.S. 1086 (1978).

Burulls' claims arising under § 12(2) of the Securities Act of 1933 similarly fail and must be dismissed.¹ It is undisputed that the Burulls are the sellers of securities with respect to all transactions at issue in this action. Consequently, the Burulls do not have a remedy under § 12(2), since that section provides a remedy only to defrauded purchasers of securities. See Hiduchenko v. Minneapolis Medical & Diagnostic Center, 467 F. Supp. 103, 106 (D. Minn. 1979) (Alsop, C.J.); Darvin v. Bache Halsey Stuart Shields, 479 F.Supp. 460, 463 (S.D.N.Y. 1979). See also Greater Iowa Corp. v. McLendon, 378 F.2d at 789.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The renewed motions for summary judgment of defendants, First Bank of Minneapolis and Arthur Young & Company, are denied.
2. The renewed motion for summary judgment of plaintiffs, Robert and Jeanne Burull, is denied.
3. The court on its own motion dismisses the claims of plaintiffs, Robert and Jeanne Burull, arising under § 17(a) and § 12(2) of the Securities Act of 1933 and Counts Two, Three, Five, Six, Nine, Ten, Twelve, and Thirteen of plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint are hereby dismissed.

Dated: April 2, 1986.

¹ Such claims include Counts Three, Six, Nine, and Twelve of the Second Amended Complaint.

Paul A. Magnuson
United States District Judge

